

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ARTHUR MAYO,

Case No.: 2:16-cv-00047-APG-VCF

**Plaintiff**

## **Order Accepting Report and Recommendation and Dismissing Case**

V.

JOSEPH WILLIAMS, et al.,

## Defendants

[ECF No. 93]

On September 5, 2019, Magistrate Judge Ferenbach recommended that I dismiss this case because plaintiff Arthur Mayo failed to update his address, did not respond to orders, failed to file a response to an order to show cause, and did not appear at a show cause hearing. ECF No. 93. Mayo did not file an objection. Thus, I am not obligated to conduct de novo review of the report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (requiring district court to “make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings to which objection is made”); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (“the district judge must review the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations de novo if objection is made, but not otherwise” (emphasis in original)).

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Magistrate Judge Ferenbach's report and  
recommendation (**ECF No. 93**) is accepted and plaintiff Arthur Mayo's amended complaint  
**No. 64**) is DISMISSED with prejudice. The clerk of court is instructed to enter  
judgment in favor of the defendants and against the plaintiff.

DATED this 26th day of September, 2019.

  
ANDREW P. GORDON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE